

create the plasma flow which allows vaporization of the substance at the applied energy produced temperature below the vaporizing temperature of the substance at the preset pressure.

The rejection is based on the assertion that “Miyazaki, as set forth [forth] in the prior rejection teaches the claimed subject matter except for showing use of a tapered envelope, as now set forth [forth] in the amended claims.” And the prior rejection is stated “[S]ince the pressure is reduced  $8 \times 10^{-7}$  torr, it is obvious that the melting temperature is sufficiently reduced as claimed.” These assertions are contrary to the underlying portion of each of the claims. With respect to claim 1, it is specifically stated that it is at a temperature substantially below the melting temperature of the solid at the preset pressure...to melt the solid. Similarly, for claims 6, 9 and 21, it is at a “temperature below the vaporization temperature of the substance at the preset pressure...allows vaporization of the substance.” As is well-known, lowering the pressure lowers the temperature, but the claims specifically requires that its is below the melting or vaporization temperature at the preset pressure. Thus, the references of record do not meet or make obvious this limitation in each of the independent claims. Thus, there is no need to address the interpretation of Piper which Applicant also respectfully traversed.

Upon review of the pending claims, it will be evident that they are allowable over the art and thus should pass this case to issue is thankfully solicited.

It is respectfully requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response and shortages in other fees be charged, or any overpayment in fees be credited, to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg LLP, Deposit Account No. 02-1010 (32492/41888).

Respectfully submitted,

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP

Perry Palan  
Reg. No. 26,213